

January 31, 2022

Municipality of Port Hope  
56 Queen Street  
Port Hope, ON L1A 3Z9

**Attention:** Mike van den Broek,  
Engineering Manager, Works & Engineering

Dear Mr. van den Broek:

**Reference: 65 Ward Street  
Site Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment Applications  
Response to Transportation Comments  
Our File No.: 120226**

---

The below includes responses to the comments provided in the memorandum dated December 6, 2021.

**Works and Engineering Department**

1. At the entrances to the site, sidewalks should be continuous with driveway curb starting and terminating at the edge of the sidewalk. Current driveway shows curb going through sidewalk.

**Acknowledged.**

2. All culverts will need to conform to Municipality of Port Hope Standards Material type HDPE, not CSP.

**Acknowledged.**

3. Attached are the comments from our traffic consultant (GHD) below. In the event that any new or additional/revised information needs to be reviewed by the traffic consultant, this additional cost shall be borne by the applicant. Our traffic consultant (GHD) has indicated that \$1,000.00 should be sufficient in the event of a review being requested.

**Responses to comments provided by GHD are included below.**

**Comments from GHD**

4. Section 3.0 Projected Traffic

The site trip generation used the ITE Trip Generation Manual to determine the future number of trips. While this method is acceptable, it may have been better to count the number of trips at the existing facility driveways and develop a comparative method to establish the trips at the new, larger facility.

**Acknowledged.**

5. The trip distribution is based on the traffic count at Ward Street/Hope Street. This is generally a reasonable approach but could have been refined by using existing driveway counts. By using only the count at the Ward Street/Hope Street intersection, it is somewhat difficult to definitively determine the number of vehicles that will use Princess Street to access the facility.

**Acknowledged.**

6. The trip assignment is conjecture and could be refined through data collected at the existing driveways. Because the traffic volumes generated by the facility are low, any changes to the assignment are unlikely to change the results of the study.

**Acknowledged.**

7. The method of using census data to estimate vehicular trips is not acceptable. The traffic counts collected in 2016 and 2021 (AADT) suggest that there is traffic growth on Hope Street South of 4.76%. The population growth, as used in the study, is not a good indicator of traffic growth. Traffic volumes are a better indication of traffic growth.

**The annual background volume growth has been adjusted to 5% in the revised TIA. Note that despite this adjustment, Ward Street/Hope Street is still projected to operate at an LOS A during all peak hours in future conditions.**

8. Section 4.0 Analysis

There are a lot of access driveways to the facility and the traffic needs would be adequately served by reducing the number of access driveways. Having fewer access driveways is generally better for pedestrian safety because it reduced conflict areas. It is suggested that a review of the site driveways be conducted and that the following changes be considered:

- Close driveway on Hope Street;
- Make the drop-off loop one-way from Ward Street to Hope Street;
- Close one of the access driveways on Princess Street, unless it can be shown that two driveways are required for maintenance vehicles.

These changes would reduce conflict locations between driveways and the local road network.

**The loop between Ward Street and Hope Street has been changed to a one-way loop, and the southern access to Princess Street has been closed. The access to Hope Street and the northern access to Princess Street will remain, as both of these accesses are required to accommodate loading/delivery and garbage collection vehicles.**

9. The bidirectional loop in the front of the building may not be necessary and having lay-bys on both sides of the driveway would require elderly, and potentially mobility challenged, people to walk across the driveway. If the loop was one-way from Ward Street to Hope Street, the lay-by would be on the building side. Also, a one-way loop would reduce the conflicting turning movements at McCaul Street. From the report, “the northerly access to Hope Street South is offset approximately 20m to the north of McCaul Street, measuring centre to centre. The offset intersections will result in overlapping northbound left turns into the subject site and southbound left turns onto McCaul Street.” This overlapping movement could be avoided by changing the driveway loop to one-way.

**This loop has been changed to one-way (entering on Ward Street and exiting on Hope Street).**

10. There are concerns about the lack of parking during construction and that the use of the local roadway network for parking would provide insufficient spaces. In the report, there is some analysis of the available number of on-street parking spaces but there is no evaluation of the current use of these spaces. It is important that the current use of on-street parking be taken into account and it is suggested that a parking utilization study be undertaken for the local street network surrounding the existing and proposed facility. The Municipality should confirm the study area for the parking utilization survey.

**We understand that the proponent has committed to securing off-street parking during construction, such that on-street parking will not be utilized. Therefore, an on-street parking utilization survey is not required.**

11. Although concerns about sightlines have been raised in the report, there is no existing collision information that suggests that there is a collision risk at the Princess Street/Ward Street intersection. The intersection is likely a low-volume intersection, but this could be confirmed through traffic counts undertaken at this intersection. The speed limit on Ward Street is 50 km/h and the low speed and low-volume character of the intersection suggests that despite the sightline requirements from the TAC Guideline not being met, that the collision risk is low.

**Acknowledged.**

We trust these responses adequately address the transportation comments related to the proposed development. Should you have any questions or further concerns, please do not hesitate to call.

Yours truly,



Joshua Audia, B.Sc.  
E.I.T. | Transportation/Traffic